

**REMARKS**

The above amendments and these remarks are responsive to the Office Action mailed May 10, 2005. Prior to entry of this amendment, claims 1-6 were pending in the application. Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee (U.S. Patent No. 6,880,934). New claims 34-40 have been added.

Claim 1 recites:

An apparatus for adjusting keystone comprising:

a first frame to pivot about a first axis;

a second frame pivotably mounted in the first frame to pivot about a second axis; and

a mirror moveably mounted in the second frame to reflect an image on a screen of a display device, the mirror adapted to pivot about the first axis via the first frame and pivot about the second axis via the second frame to adjust image on the screen to enable user adjustable keystone correction of the image relative the screen.

In contrast to claim 1, Lee discloses a system to adjust the position of a red mirror and blue mirror in a projection device. As described by Lee, "since the progressive direction of the light incident on the dichroic prism is determined by the red mirror 9 and the second blue mirror 12, it is important to set the position of the red mirror 9 and the second blue mirror 12 properly." (col. 1, lines 53-58). Lee's system provides an adjustment system for the red and blue mirror to address the following difficulties. (col. 1, lines 64-66 and col. 2, lines 1-11):

However, in a conventional LCD projector illuminating system, the red mirror 9 and the second blue mirror 12 are placed in an optical case, which is an injection-molded material, in which the position cannot be changed.

Therefore, the conventional LCD projector illuminating system cannot adjust the position of the red mirror 9 and the second blue mirror 12 even though the position of the red mirror 9 and the second blue mirror 12 are deviated due to transformation and contraction of the optical case after the optical case is injection-molded. As a result, the quality of image formed on a screen is deteriorated which is sometimes shown on a screen, for example, yellow color appears on the right and left contour parts of the screen. Moreover, the problem of not being able to adjust the illuminating system may even cause the production efficiency is be lowered.

Lee provides an adjustment method which enables rotation of the mirror plate (and thus adjustment of the reflection angle of the mirror) in a counterclockwise direction (Fig. 6A) and a clockwise direction (Fig. 6B). As described "the mirror M is attached to the side of the mirror plate 70." (col. 3, lines 34, 35).

Fig. 6A






Fig. 6B



In contrast, Applicant's claim recites an apparatus for adjusting keystone (see Applicant's abstract). Further, in Figs. 5a, 5b, 6a, and 6b, adjustment of a mirror is shown about a first axis (Figs. 5a and 5b) and a second axis (Figs. 6a and 6b).



Claim 1, as amended, recites “a mirror moveably mounted in the second frame to reflect an image on a screen of a display device, the mirror adapted to pivot about the first axis via the first frame and pivot about the second axis via the second frame to adjust the image on the screen to enable user adjustable keystone correction of the image relative the screen.” Lee does not disclose a mirror mount that enables adjustment of the image on the screen, nor a mirror moveably mounted to enable user adjustable keystone correction. Instead, Lee describes an apparatus for adjusting the position of the red and blue mirror to a dichroic prism – not a screen and not the keystone of the image.

Further Lee provides a mirror which is mounted on a mirror plate. Lee’s mirror is not moveably mounted in a second frame and rotation appears to be only about a single axis such that the rotation is either counterclockwise or clockwise (see Figs. 6a and 6B). As described in Lee, the mirror plate is “rotated right and left around the fixed projection” (col. 5, lines 35-36). Rotation around a second axis is not described.

Thus, it is believed that Lee does not anticipate claim 1. Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) has been overcome and requests that this rejection be withdrawn. Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1, and for at least the reasons described above in regards to claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests the rejections to the dependent claims also be withdrawn.

Applicant has added new claims 34-40. Support for these claims is found throughout the specification. No new matter has been added.

Applicant believes that this application is now in condition for allowance, in view of the above amendments and remarks. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner issue a Notice of Allowability covering the pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions, or if a telephone interview would in any way advance prosecution of the application, please contact the undersigned attorney of record.


Respectfully submitted,

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO via facsimile number 571-273-8300 on October 10, 2005.

  
Nicole Fye

ALLEMAN HALL MCCOY  
RUSSELL & TUTTLE, LLP



B. Anna McCoy

Registration No. 46,077

Customer No. 50488

Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)/Assignee

806 SW Broadway, Suite 600

Portland, OR 97205

Tel: (503) 459-4141

Fax: (503) 459-4142